Mechanism vs. Dogma: Quantum Gravity's Empirical Edge on vixra Against arXiv's Exclusionary Filters

N. B. Cook
Independent Researcher
vixra:1111.0111, vixra:1511.0067
https://nige.wordpress.com/

April 1, 2025

Abstract

arXiv's automated filters and moderators, dissected by Reyes-Galindo (2016), reject the author's predictive quantum gravity (vixra:1111.0111) not for flaws but for defying string theory's orthodoxy. This 20-page analysis details a mechanistic QFT—graviton scattering (10^{-108} m^2) and cosmological $F = ma$—yielding electron mass (0.515 MeV vs. 0.511 MeV) and proton mass (945 MeV vs. 938.272 MeV). Against string theory's untestable hype, vixra preserves this work, embodying Mill's "silencing assumes infallibility" (Cook, 2015). Evidence, not elitism, defines science.

1 Introduction: The Fight for Scientific Truth

Physics should prize evidence, yet arXiv's gatekeeping buries it. My 2011 paper (vixra:1111.0111), uniting gravity with the Standard Model via vacuum mechanisms, was rejected—not refuted—by arXiv's elitist filters. Reyes-Galindo (2016) exposes this bias; my blog (https://nige.wordpress.com/) documents its cost. Mill's dictum—"All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility" (Cook, 2015)—frames this 20-page case: my work's predictions shame mainstream dogma, and vixra keeps science alive.

2 arXiv's Exclusionary Machinery

2.1 Technical Filters: Keyword Tyranny

Reyes-Galindo (2016, p. 8) describes arXiv's Bayesian classifier, sorting by "technical keywords" (e.g., "superconductivity," p. 9). My 2011 paper's focus—graviton cross-sections (10^{-108} m^2, p. 2)—lacks string theory's buzzwords, flagging it as "fringe." Ginsparg admits (p. 9) it spots "quality" by content fit—my mechanics, rooted in Feynman's rules (p. 2), doesn't fit.

2.2 Stylistic Filters: Aesthetic Prejudice

The stylistic filter (p. 10) uses Zipf's Law to flag prose deviating from mainstream norms. My 2011 paper's Newtonian clarity (p. 4) contrasts string theory's jargon, triggering rejection. Reyes-Galindo quotes Ginsparg: "Outsiders don't emulate the style" (p. 10)—aesthetic gatekeeping, not science.

2.3 Moderator Subjectivity: Gen-ph Exile

Moderators, unpaid and biased (p. 7), reclassify to gen-ph—"crackpot" limbo (p. 12)—based on "interestingness" (p. 6). My work, predicting masses (p. 61), echoes Sisyphus's fate (p. 14): hep-th credentials, yet banished for unorthodoxy. Only 1

2.4 The Stigma's Toll

Blogs call gen-ph "trash" (p. 12-13); my 2011 paper's exclusion reflects fear of its challenge, not flaws. Reyes-Galindo's "invisibility" (p. 15) aligns with my blog's "censorship" (22 May 2009)—arXiv assumes infallibility, per Mill (Cook, 2015).

3 A Mechanistic Quantum Gravity

3.1 Graviton Scattering: The Core Mechanism

Cook (2011, p. 2): gravity emerges from graviton scattering. Cross-section:

$$\sigma_g = \sigma_w \left(\frac{G}{G_F}\right)^2 \approx 10^{-80} \text{ barns} \cdot \left(\frac{6.674 \times 10^{-11}}{1.166 \times 10^{-5}}\right)^2 \approx 10^{-108} \text{ m}^2$$

where σ_w is weak interaction cross-section, G gravitational coupling, G_F Fermi constant. Feynman's rule—probability $\propto$ coupling squared (p. 2)—grounds this.

3.2 Cosmological Force: $F = ma$

Isotropic acceleration $a = 6 \times 10^{-10}$ ms^{-2} (p. 3) drives:

$$F = ma = (3 \times 10^{52} \text{ kg})(6 \times 10^{-10} \text{ ms}^{-2}) = 1.8 \times 10^{43} \text{ N}$$

Newton's 3rd law implies equal inward force (p. 3). Gravity's asymmetry:

$$F_g = F_{\text{total}} \frac{\pi r^2}{4\pi R^2}, \quad r = \frac{2GM}{c^2}$$

yields $G = c^4/(ma)$ (p. 5).

3.3 Lagrangian Match

Newtonian limit (p. 4):

$$R_{00} \approx \nabla^2 k = \frac{4\pi G\rho}{c^2}$$

Corrected via Bianchi identity (p. 5):

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^2} T_{\mu\nu}$$

Matches general relativity (p. 5).

3.4 Mass Predictions

Baryon rule: 105 MeV multiples (p. 61):

$$m_e = 1.5 \cdot 0.511 \cdot 137 = 105 \text{ MeV}, \quad \text{predicted} = 0.515 \text{ MeV}$$

Proton: $9 \cdot 105 = 945$ MeV (p. 61). Errors: 0.78%, 0.73%.

4 String Theory's Empirical Void

4.1 No Predictions

Blog (7 May 2009): "String theory's orthodoxy"—40 years, zero tests. Witten's 2006 *Nature* dodge (Cook, 2015, p. 1) admits it.

4.2 arXiv's Shield

Filters favor its jargon (Reyes-Galindo, p. 9), rejecting my mechanics (Cook, 2011).

5 vixra: Science's Lifeline

5.1 Open Platform

Hosts Cook (2011, 2015), defying arXiv's 1

5.2 Ethical Clarity

Kohlberg's stage 6 (Cook, 2011, p. 55): vixra revises rules; arXiv stalls at stage 4.

6 Groupthink's Pseudoscience

6.1 Conformity's Grip

Orwell's "crimestop" (Cook, 2011, p. 61): arXiv's mindset. Blog (7 May 2009): "String conspiracy."

6.2 Evidence Ignored

My predictions (Cook, 2011) threaten dogma, earning exile—not refutation.

7 Conclusion

My QFT's evidence trumps string theory's hype. arXiv's bias is pseudoscience; vixra and logic win.